

Food and Drug Administration, and the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Dr. Barthwell also has worked with policy makers at the highest levels of state and federal government. I urge the Senate to confirm Dr. Barthwell's nomination as soon as possible. Her contributions will be invaluable as the White House implements the President's addiction treatment expansion initiative, one which could go a long way to help our country effectively deal with the serious domestic drug addiction problem that it faces.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization conferees, particularly Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER, for retaining the language adopted by the Senate with regard to reforming the Federal Prison Industries.

During consideration of the Defense authorization bill, the Senate voted 74-24 to table an amendment that would have removed the Federal Prison Industries reform provision from the bill.

Section 821 of the bill, which has now been endorsed by the conference and adopted overwhelmingly by both the House and the Senate, ends FPI's "mandatory source" status as a supplier of products to the Department of Defense, DOD. When this bill becomes law, FPI will be required to compete for future Department of Defense contracts that have been previously monopolized under FPI's "mandatory source" status dating back to 1934. Most importantly, this provision will enable the Department of Defense to determine, for itself, whether the FPI can best meet the Department's needs in terms of price, quality, and time of delivery. If the DOD determines that the FPI product is not the best one available, the Department can purchase a more competitive product to meet its needs.

I would like to point out that by eliminating the Federal Prison Industries' mandatory source status, this reform affects another controversial marketing scheme that the FPI developed in recent years. As a result of this bill, the FPI will no longer be able to require Defense contractors to use their products. Let me give an example of what this means: when the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, NAVFAC, the Corps of Engineers, Air Force, or any other Defense agency issues a contract for architect-engineer, A/E, services, the A/E firm cannot be forced to specify FPI products, such as office furniture systems, in its designs and specifications. It is my view that architects and engineers should be free to specify products, such as modular office systems, interior design, and other products, that provide the highest quality design, best value, and greatest functionality to the Federal Government. Should the FPI continue to mandate that subcontractors use FPI products it would be in direct con-

flict with the underlying provisions of the Defense authorization language—in effect circumventing congressional intent.

Mr. President, I also want my colleagues to know that there are still a number of issues related to the practices of the Federal Prison Industries that Congress must address in the near future. Senator LEVIN and I have introduced a broader initiative—S. 1295—that seeks to make a number of needed, government-wide reforms affecting the sales and services by FPI. We are also working with the bipartisan team of Representatives HOEKSTRA, FRANK, COLLINS, MALONEY, and SENSENBRENNER of their companion bill, H.R. 1577. It is my hope that when we return in January, Congress will take up comprehensive Federal Prison Industry reform. It is also my strong desire that the Bush administration address this issue administratively. Many of the problems we are experiencing with the FPI have not been the result of legislative action, but rather administrative expansion. I look forward to working with Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER in oversight of the implementation of this provision in the Defense Department's acquisition regulations.

I have a long record of interest in the issue of unfair government competition with the private sector. When the government needs commercially available products and services, the government should go to the competitive, private sector market to procure those services. Such full and open competition leads to the highest quality, the most fair and reasonable price, and the overall best value for the taxpayer. I am pleased the Congress is taking another step in that direction by enacting the FPI reforms in this bill. Once again, I commend Senator LEVIN and Senator WARNER for their leadership, and I thank them for the cooperation they have extended to me in this matter.

THE PACIFIC SALMON RECOVERY ACT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, Senator BOXER introduced last Thursday, December 13, 2001, the Pacific Salmon Recovery Act that will grant Federal funding for State and Tribal salmon recovery efforts in California, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska. I would like to thank her and her staff for their hard work and for Senator BOXER's determination to have a bipartisan bill on salmon recovery. I also would like to thank my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAPO, Senators SMITH and WYDEN from Oregon, and Senator FEINSTEIN from California, for their valuable input that clearly helped to create responsible and effective bipartisan legislation to recover salmon. I enjoyed working with all of them and their staff.

For over 20 years, California, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, have attempted mightily to sustain salmon runs in river basins throughout the

West and, along with the Federal Government, have invested billions of dollars in that effort.

Many individual citizens in my State of Idaho and some special interest groups from around the country have quite frequently criticized justly the expenditures of these large sums of money for salmon recovery. The criticism often pointed to poor coordination among State, Federal, and Tribal fish and wildlife agencies, as well as to ineffective recovery programs developed either by those agencies or under their supervision.

The Pacific Salmon Recovery Act, S. 1825, takes aim at these infirmities and establishes a framework that will ensure better coordination and more effective recovery programs. I am convinced that we'll get better "bang for the buck" if this bill is enacted.

However, salmon recovery is complex. Recent scientific research has underscored the difficulty in finding quick solutions to salmon recovery. Scientists have been candid in stating unequivocally that there is no "silver bullet" that can cure what is causing diminishing salmon returns. The focus on dam removal during the last several years has retarded progress in recovering salmon. The majority of a salmon's life cycle is spent in the ocean. It is there that the salmon nourishes itself and prepares for the arduous journey back to spawning areas. What is becoming increasingly clear from new ocean research is that warm ocean temperature is causing a severe reduction in the ocean's salmon carrying capacity. More research in this area will provide helpful insight as to what can be done to adjust to that devastating fact. The recent change to colder Pacific Ocean temperatures is widely credited for the record salmon returns that the Pacific Northwest has experienced this year. It is my hope that a more open dialogue on ways to approach salmon recovery will ensure continued progress on effective measures that will both recover these fish and protect the economy of the West. It is my belief that this bill will enhance the prospect of achieving that goal.

There are many good provisions in this bill. For example, it authorizes \$350 million a year over the next five years to be spent on salmon recovery, a sizable amount that I hope will be appropriated by Congress each of those years. But I would like to highlight the peer review provisions in particular. Those provisions require each State or Tribal science based recovery activity to undergo scientific peer review before that activity will be funded with Federal money. It is modeled on the very successful peer review requirement contained in the Northwest Power Act for State and Tribal salmon recovery programs that get Pacific Northwest ratepayer money.

Ensuring accountability for large expenditures of taxpayer money is essential to keep the trust of the American taxpayer.